

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED  
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE  
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND  
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON  
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE,  
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

UNCLASSIFIED

AD - 4 9 0 0 4 2

DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER

FOR

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

UNANNOUNCED

AD NO. AD 490 042

FILE COPY

414744



Please Return to:  
Chief of Naval Research (Code 458)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington 25, D. C.

(6) MECHANICAL APTITUDE V.

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP TESTS  
OF MECHANICAL APTITUDE

(10) by L. L. Thurstone

(16) Under Contract with the Office of Naval Research  
Project N6ori-20, Task Order 12  
ONR Project No. NR 151-039

(5) THE PSYCHOMETRIC LABORATORY,  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NUMBER 57

(11) MAY, 1950

## INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP TESTS OF MECHANICAL APTITUDE\*

This paper is one of several reports on the experimental work on mechanical aptitude that has been done in the Psychometric Laboratory in the last couple of years. There were twenty-five individual tests and thirty-two group tests in this study. The tests were selected to represent current ideas about mechanical aptitude as well as a number of psychological hypotheses about the nature of these mental abilities. The analysis of the present paper deals with a comparison of two groups of boys in the Tilden High School in Chicago. A total group of 350 technical high school students were given the thirty-two group tests. In addition to the group tests these students were also given an interest schedule, a test of mechanical experience representing tool knowledge, and a test called mechanical comprehension. These three measures constituted an informal criterion for mechanical interest, mechanical aptitude, and mechanical experience. One group of forty-five boys was selected who showed exceptional mechanical interest and who had good scores on tests of mechanical experience. In the Kuder Schedule, for example, we chose for this group only those boys whose mechanical interests were definitely higher than all the other interests in the Kuder Schedule. The low mechanical interest group was selected in the same manner. It consisted of forty-five boys who had exceptionally low mechanical interest, poor performance in tests of tool knowledge and mechanical experience, and poor performance in tests of mechanical comprehension. These two groups constituted about one-fourth of the total experimental population in Tilden High School. One of the problems was to compare these two groups of subjects who represented high and low mechanical interest and aptitude. The comparison was made separately for each of the thirty-two group tests and also for each of twenty-five individual tests which were given to these selected groups of students. The same data were used for factorial analyses of mechanical aptitude, but those studies are summarized in other reports.<sup>1</sup>

The selection of the tests which should represent mechanical aptitude was done with several considerations in mind. Many of the current tests that pretend to estimate mechanical aptitude call for little more than finger dexterity, and manipulatory speed or skill. We included a number of tests of this character even though we do not believe that such tests represent mechanical aptitude. Another consideration was the concept of mechanical aptitude as representing essential intellectual functions. Such interpretations of mechanical aptitude are represented by those tests in which the subject's success or failure depends on his ability to use his head on mechanical problems. A criterion could, of course, be set up so as to represent either manipulatory speed and dexterity or the ability to think about mechanical relations.

A criterion could be designed formally as a linear combination of the three criterion measures, but we preferred to select the high and low interest groups in an informal manner. The criterion can be designated as a mere sum of the three criterion test scores. Such a variable is represented on the base line of Figure 1. On this base line we have represented the total population as a histogram. The high and low mechanical interest groups are also represented

---

\*Prepared in connection with research sponsored by the Office of Naval Research, Project N6ori-20, Task Order 12, ONR Project No. NR 151-039. The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Thomas Jeffrey who was responsible for the computing in this study.

1. The other parts in this study have also been prepared as Psychometric Laboratory reports as follows: Number 54, Mechanical Aptitude II, Description of Group Tests; Number 55, Mechanical Aptitude III, Analysis of Group Tests; Number 56, Mechanical Aptitude IV, Description of Individual Tests. These reports will be submitted for publication in psychological journals.

in Figure 1. The findings are summarized in several tables. In Table 1 are listed the twenty-five individual tests<sup>2</sup> together with the principal information about each test, including the number of cases in the two groups, the two group means, the two dispersions, and the t-value. These values indicate the relative effectiveness with which the tests and schedules separate those with high mechanical interest and aptitude from those who have low scores in this criterion. In this table the t-value is 2.64 for the one per cent level, and 1.99 at the five per cent level.

The individual tests that differentiated best between the two groups were the Crissey Test (19), Purdue Assembly (16), Stencil Designs (1), Kent-Shakow Form Board (6), and the Wiggly Blocks (8). For all of these tests the t-value was between 6.0 and over 8.0. In all of these tests the subject was asked to assemble a number of pieces into a whole with some spatial restrictions. The most differentiating of these tests was the Crissey Test which required the subject to see the relations between several mechanisms. The least differentiating of these tests were Peg Board (2 and 3), Rate of Manipulation (11 and 12), and Link Dial (20). Inspection of these tests makes it immediately apparent that they feature speed of manipulation and that they represent relatively little mental effort or mechanical understanding. Since most of the tests in this list except the Rate of Manipulation tests are differentiating at the one per cent level or better, our judgments are made here on relative differentiation among tests, most of which differentiate the two criterion groups satisfactorily.

Table 2 shows similar data for the group tests. All of the group tests were in paper-pencil form. The most differentiating among the group tests were Mechanical Movements (14), Surface Development (15), Block Assembly (30), Gottschaldt Figures (8), Block Counting (1), Paper Puzzles (2), and Lozenges A (17).

In this list we find also that the majority of the group tests in paper-pencil form differentiated successfully between the two criterion groups. Here also we are judging the relative values in a large group of tests. Several tests were shown to be definitely not useful in that their differentiation was not satisfactory. These tests were Hands (5), and Jig Saw Pieces (21). The Hands Test (5) may represent a kinesthetic factor, but this factor is also present in Bolts (7) which is differentiating. This may possibly be explained by an experience factor in Bolts (7). Perhaps a better explanation of the difference between the Hands and Bolts tests is that the Hands test called for differentiation of right and left whereas the Bolts test asked the subject to indicate the desired direction of rotation without calling it either right or left. The test Jig Saw Pieces (21) has low differentiating value and this lends support to the inference that mechanical aptitude is not characterized in any essential way by ability to make very fine discriminations in size, shape, and line length. The test Jig Saw Pieces (21) was designed to ascertain whether mechanical aptitude represented the ability to make rather fine discriminations in shape. The indication here seems to be that such an ability is not a major characteristic of mechanical aptitude. Test 21 does not have any significant saturation on any of the factors that are interpreted, and its communality is only .25. The ability to make fine discriminations in curved shapes does not have any appreciable variance in common with the rest of this battery.

Since the group test battery was factorially analyzed, it is of some interest to examine

---

2. These tests are described in detail in the following microfilms which are available from the University of Chicago Library microfilm department. Negative No. 1767, Mechanical Aptitude II, Description of Group Tests; Negative No. 1844, Mechanical Aptitude III, Analysis of Group Tests; Negative No. 1845, Mechanical Aptitude IV, Description of Individual Tests.

the factorial composition of tests that were most differentiating. Block Counting does not have any outstanding factorial saturations in the factors that were interpreted. Paper Puzzles had some saturation in the second space factor and in the second closure factor. Gettschaldt Figures (8) showed appreciable saturation in the second closure factor. Mechanical Movements (14) has strong saturation in the second space factor. Surface Development (15) had its highest saturation on the second space factor. Lozenges A (17) had highest saturation in the third space factor. Block Assembly (30) showed its strongest saturation in the third memory factor and some saturation in the second space factor. Inspection of this kind lead to the conclusion that the second space factor is heavily represented in mechanical aptitude and that the second closure factor is also here represented although not so strongly as  $S_2$ .

In Tables 3 and 4 we have summarized the differentiating values of personality traits and activity interest with special reference to mechanical aptitude and interest. Table 3 shows the t-values for the seven scores in a temperament schedule.<sup>3</sup> It is not surprising to find that masculinity which is represented by the athletic interests (26) differentiates the two criterion groups quite satisfactorily. Of equal interest is the fact that the score in sociability (31) correlates negatively with mechanical interest. According to these findings, we should conclude that socially outgoing individuals tend to rate lower than average in mechanical aptitude. The same conclusion is supported though less emphatically by considering the three scores, leadership (29), emotional stability (30), and sociability (31). In all three of these scores the criterion group with high mechanical aptitude and interest scored lower than the criterion group which is characterized by low mechanical aptitude and interest. This finding is specially marked for the score in sociability (31). Table 4 shows the t-values for the scores in the Kuder Interest Schedule. In this table we have omitted the score in mechanical interest because that was a part of the criterion by which the two criterion groups were selected. By the construction of the Kuder Schedule, it follows that a high score in one field necessarily implies a correspondingly lower score in other traits. Several of the t-values are of special interest for the present problem. Scientific interests (35) show definite association with mechanical interests, and this is as we should expect. On the other hand, the results show a negative association between mechanical aptitude and musical, literary, persuasive, and computational interests. The negative association seems especially clear for literary and musical interests. It looks, therefore, as if people with mechanical aptitude and interests are not ordinarily found among socially outgoing people or among those with strong literary or musical interests.

These studies indicate pretty clearly that a successful test for mechanical aptitude should feature primarily the second space factor. The second closure factor contributes significantly although it is less important than the space factor  $S_2$ . The majority of the group tests in this study differentiated between the two criterion groups with t-values at the one per cent level of significance or better. Hence it may be inferred that the primary abilities which characterize this battery can be used for differentiating individuals with mechanical aptitude. However, there are marked differences among the tests. Some factors are definitely superior for this purpose. These factors are principally the first and second space factor  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , the two closure factors  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , as well as induction I. But it is clear from our tabulations of t-values in relation to the factorial composition of the tests that the second space factor  $S_2$  is definitely the most differentiating for mechanical aptitude.

---

3. This temperament schedule has been developed from a longer list of 340 items. The schedule is arranged in carbon scoring form with a profile on the individual answer sheet. It is published by Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

According to our interpretation the second space factor is the same factor that Guilford has called visualization. Our psychological interpretation of the second space factor is that it represents the ability to think about configurations in which there is internal displacement among the parts. To think about a mechanism in movement requires the second space factor. The same space factor seems to be involved when the subject is thinking about a single piece of material that is being deformed or altered in shape. Tests like surface development and the paper-folding test are examples of this type. It does not seem to be essential, therefore, whether the configuration consists of several distinct pieces that move with respect to each other or a single piece of material that is altered in shape. In both cases the configuration has internal movement among its parts.

The first space factor is similar except that it requires the subject to visualize rigid configurations. The question of movement does not alone differentiate between the first and second space factors. The subject may imagine the movement of the whole object or configuration as when it is displaced in the perceptual field or when it is rotated or turned over. If the configuration is rigid, it seems to involve the first space factor, but if it is subject to internal displacement among the parts, the second space factor is involved. Both of these factors involve visualization, at least in the ordinary sense of that term. The third space factor seems to be characterized by the participation of bodily orientation to the object. However, it seems to be distinct from a factor of kinesthetic imagery which is different from the third space factor. The third space factor seems to be the same as the factor that Guilford has called spatial relations. Guilford's terms, visualization and spatial relations, are descriptive of all three space factors,  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ , and  $S_3$ , but these terms are applicable to all of the space factors. No harm would be done if psychologists were to agree that these terms shall be used technically with restrictions to particular factors. It seems quite likely that the psychological interpretations that can now be written will be revised, perhaps many times, before the nature of each factor is known with some confidence. In the meantime we can only name, denote, and symbolize the primary mental abilities to represent current knowledge.






TABLE 1  
INDIVIDUAL TESTS

| Code<br>No. | Name of Test                      | No. of Cases |       | Means |       | Dispersions |            | $t$ |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|------------|-----|
|             |                                   | $N_1$        | $N_2$ | $M_1$ | $M_2$ | $\sigma_1$  | $\sigma_2$ |     |
| 1           | Stencil Designs                   | 42           | 43    | 35.7  | 48.2  | 12.1        | 6.1        | 6.0 |
| 2           | Purdue Pegboard - Insertion       | 42           | 43    | 45.1  | 45.3  | 3.54        | 3.69       | .2  |
| 3           | Purdue Pegboard - Assembly        | 42           | 43    | 20.0  | 20.9  | 2.35        | 1.85       | 1.7 |
| 4           | Freeman Puzzle Box                | 42           | 43    | 34.6  | 48.2  | 17.9        | 11.0       | 4.2 |
| 5           | Passalong                         | 42           | 43    | 58.4  | 66.1  | 8.64        | 14.09      | 3.0 |
| 6           | Kent-Shakow Form Board            | 42           | 43    | 43.3  | 61.1  | 15.5        | 6.9        | 6.7 |
| 7           | Tweezer Dexterity                 | 42           | 43    | 31.2  | 36.4  | 9.67        | 5.78       | 2.9 |
| 8           | Wiggly Blocks (trial 1 + trial 2) | 42           | 43    | 53.3  | 75.4  | 19.4        | 11.7       | 6.3 |
| 9           | Wiggly Blocks (trial 1 - trial 2) | 42           | 43    | 39.5  | 41.9  | 19.1        | 8.8        | .7  |
| 10          | Kohs Blocks                       | 42           | 43    | 49.0  | 75.4  | 24.0        | 12.9       | 6.2 |
| 11          | Rate of Manipulation (transfer)   | 42           | 43    | 14.1  | 14.7  | 5.75        | 4.59       | .5  |
| 12          | Rate of Manipulation (inversion)  | 42           | 43    | 36.2  | 35.3  | 7.74        | 5.76       | .6  |
| 13          | U-Bolt                            | 42           | 43    | 23.2  | 27.3  | 8.35        | 7.12       | 2.4 |
| 14          | Form Building                     | 42           | 43    | 39.5  | 47.1  | 12.5        | 9.8        | 3.1 |
| 15          | Rosenstein Disc                   | 42           | 43    | 66.8  | 80.3  | 21.4        | 11.4       | 3.6 |
| 16          | Purdue Assembly                   | 42           | 43    | 39.7  | 65.1  | 15.9        | 14.9       | 7.5 |
| 17          | S. A. M. Complex Coordinator      | 42           | 43    | 37.1  | 44.0  | 7.17        | 7.22       | 4.4 |
| 18          | Minnesota Assembly                | 42           | 43    | 47.5  | 69.8  | 18.1        | 11.1       | 6.7 |
| 19          | Crissey Test                      | 42           | 43    | 31.9  | 62.8  | 21.7        | 10.5       | 8.2 |
| 20          | Link Dial                         | 42           | 43    | 35.8  | 36.8  | 15.5        | 14.2       | .3  |
| 21          | Yerkes Multiple Choice            | 42           | 43    | 67.7  | 76.1  | 21.9        | 13.4       | 2.1 |
| 22          | Engine Lathe (median dist.)       | 42           | 43    | 10.7  | 14.1  | 3.40        | 1.48       | 5.8 |
| 23          | Engine Lathe (median time)        | 42           | 43    | 34.2  | 38.8  | 9.27        | 6.57       | 2.6 |
| 24          | Crawford - Pins & Collars         | 42           | 43    | 59.1  | 73.7  | 19.3        | 12.3       | 4.1 |
| 25          | Crawford - Driving Screws         | 42           | 43    | 41.9  | 54.4  | 19.7        | 13.8       | 3.4 |

TABLE 2  
GROUP TESTS

| Code<br>No. | Name of Tests                | No. of Cases   |                | Means          |                | Dispersions |            | t   |
|-------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-----|
|             |                              | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | M <sub>1</sub> | M <sub>2</sub> | $\sigma_1$  | $\sigma_2$ |     |
| 1           | Block Counting               | 41             | 39             | 42.0           | 56.7           | 11.7        | 11.1       | 5.7 |
| 2           | Paper Puzzles                | 41             | 43             | 9.9            | 15.5           | 3.75        | 5.06       | 5.7 |
| 3           | Cards                        | 39             | 42             | 29.4           | 38.4           | 11.0        | 10.4       | 3.7 |
| 4           | Figures                      | 39             | 42             | 31.8           | 40.0           | 13.8        | 11.5       | 2.9 |
| 5           | Hands                        | 42             | 43             | 29.3           | 31.0           | 13.6        | 13.5       | 0.6 |
| 6           | Copying                      | 42             | 42             | 14.1           | 20.5           | 6.71        | 7.24       | 4.1 |
| 7           | Bolts                        | 41             | 42             | 27.3           | 42.2           | 17.7        | 11.7       | 4.5 |
| 8           | Gottschaldt Figures          | 42             | 42             | 20.1           | 32.1           | 8.80        | 9.98       | 5.8 |
| 9           | Street Pictures              | 42             | 43             | 12.8           | 14.6           | 2.82        | 2.65       | 3.0 |
| 10          | Mutilated Words              | 42             | 42             | 12.3           | 13.4           | 3.89        | 3.66       | 1.3 |
| 11          | Designs                      | 40             | 41             | 22.5           | 27.1           | 7.36        | 6.32       | 3.0 |
| 12          | Memory for Pictures          | 37             | 42             | 67.5           | 71.6           | 8.08        | 6.07       | 2.5 |
| 13          | Visual Memory                | 40             | 42             | 33.3           | 36.2           | 8.93        | 7.23       | 1.6 |
| 14          | Mechanical Movements         | 38             | 43             | 24.2           | 43.7           | 9.29        | 11.88      | 8.2 |
| 15          | Surface Development          | 41             | 42             | 21.8           | 40.6           | 10.2        | 11.6       | 7.8 |
| 16          | Reversals and Rotations      | 41             | 42             | 22.4           | 32.0           | 9.14        | 11.61      | 4.1 |
| 17          | Lozenges A                   | 39             | 37             | 12.6           | 28.6           | 11.96       | 15.32      | 5.0 |
| 18          | Cubes                        | 39             | 38             | 11.1           | 19.2           | 7.20        | 8.07       | 4.6 |
| 19          | Identical Forms              | 42             | 43             | 46.6           | 52.6           | 7.91        | 5.74       | 4.0 |
| 20          | Mutilated Pictures           | 41             | 42             | 16.1           | 19.8           | 3.91        | 4.85       | 3.7 |
| 21          | Jig Saw Pieces               | 42             | 42             | 17.9           | 19.2           | 8.50        | 8.08       | 0.7 |
| 22          | Memory for Geometric Designs | 39             | 42             | 15.4           | 18.5           | 5.28        | 4.19       | 2.9 |
| 23          | Picture Squares              | 39             | 41             | 11.0           | 12.1           | 3.45        | 2.84       | 1.5 |
| 24          | Letter Series                | 40             | 37             | 14.1           | 17.8           | 5.52        | 4.86       | 3.1 |
| 25          | Letter Grouping              | 41             | 43             | 15.9           | 19.2           | 4.35        | 3.01       | 4.0 |
| 26          | Figure Analogies             | 41             | 40             | 16.4           | 19.9           | 5.28        | 3.41       | 3.5 |
| 27          | Figure Grouping              | 41             | 42             | 18.4           | 21.7           | 3.52        | 2.67       | 4.8 |
| 29          | Rotation of Solid Figures    | 41             | 39             | 7.61           | 9.95           | 3.05        | 2.49       | 3.7 |
| 30          | Block Assembly               | 41             | 43             | 9.88           | 15.67          | 4.38        | 4.26       | 6.1 |
| 32          | Electrical Experience        | 41             | 40             | 35.6           | 45.1           | 5.30        | 6.41       | 7.2 |

TABLE 3  
THURSTONE TEMPERAMENT SCHEDULE

| Code No. | Name of Variable   |    | No. of Cases   |                | Means          |                | Dispersions |            | t    |
|----------|--------------------|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|------------|------|
|          |                    |    | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | M <sub>1</sub> | M <sub>2</sub> | $\sigma_1$  | $\sigma_2$ |      |
| 26       | Athletic           | At | 42             | 43             | 11.1           | 12.7           | 3.18        | 2.62       | 2.5  |
| 27       | Active             | Ac | 42             | 43             | 8.60           | 9.81           | 2.89        | 3.25       | 1.8  |
| 28       | Impulsive          | I  | 42             | 43             | 11.1           | 11.5           | 3.28        | 2.57       | 0.5  |
| 29       | Leadership         | L  | 42             | 43             | 7.64           | 7.23           | 3.60        | 3.84       | 0.5# |
| 30       | Emotionally Stable | St | 42             | 43             | 9.60           | 9.30           | 3.14        | 3.24       | 0.4# |
| 31       | Sociable           | So | 42             | 43             | 10.2           | 8.9            | 2.70        | 2.33       | 2.4# |
| 32       | Reflective         | R  | 42             | 43             | 6.07           | 6.86           | 2.72        | 2.85       | 1.3  |

# In these variables, Leadership, Sociability, and Emotional Stability, group I rated higher than group II.

TABLE 4  
KUDER INTEREST SCHEDULE

| Code No. | Name of Variable         |  | No. of Cases   |                | Means          |                | Dispersions |            | t    |
|----------|--------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|------------|------|
|          |                          |  | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | M <sub>1</sub> | M <sub>2</sub> | $\sigma_1$  | $\sigma_2$ |      |
| 34       | Computational interests  |  | 42             | 42             | 33.3           | 30.0           | 8.62        | 7.50       | 1.9# |
| 35       | Scientific interests     |  | 42             | 42             | 66.5           | 75.0           | 14.5        | 11.5       | 2.9  |
| 36       | Persuasive interests     |  | 42             | 42             | 65.2           | 59.9           | 11.7        | 10.1       | 2.2# |
| 37       | Artistic interests       |  | 42             | 42             | 51.0           | 56.6           | 13.8        | 13.0       | 1.9  |
| 38       | Literary interests       |  | 42             | 42             | 48.7           | 41.2           | 12.1        | 10.0       | 3.0# |
| 39       | Musical interests        |  | 42             | 42             | 23.3           | 16.2           | 10.1        | 8.8        | 3.4# |
| 40       | Social Service interests |  | 42             | 42             | 64.2           | 61.0           | 13.1        | 14.4       | 1.1# |
| 41       | Clerical interests       |  | 42             | 42             | 51.9           | 45.9           | 11.2        | 9.2        | 2.6  |

# In several traits, group I rated higher than group II. These were Computational, Persuasive, Literary, Musical, and Social Service interests.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED